

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 15-35 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant AMENDS the title of the invention and claims 15-23, 26-30, and 33-35.

In response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated November 24, 2008, Applicant has changed the status identifier of Claim 28 to properly be "currently amended." Applicant has made no other material changes in this Amendment from the Amendment filed on October 27, 2008. Applicant respectfully requests entry and consideration of this Amendment.

Applicant has amended claims 15-23, 26-30, and 33-35 to correct minor informalities contained therein, and to remove any language that could possibly be construed as falling under 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph.

The title of the invention was objected to for allegedly failing to clearly indicate the invention to which the claims are directed. Applicant has amended the title of the invention accordingly. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the title of the invention.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner did not clearly acknowledge on the Office Action Summary Form PTOL-326 if all of the foreign priority documents were received. The Examiner is respectfully requested to indicate in the next Office Action that all of the foreign priority documents were received and officially made of record in this application.

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nir et al. (U.S. 6,704,699). Claims 15, 16, 27, 28, 34, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nir et al. in view of Harwood et al. (U.S. 7,050,834). Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nir et al. and Harwood et al., and further in view of Matsumoto et al. (U.S. 5,206,634). Claims 18, 19, 21-23, 29, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nir et al. and Harwood et al., and further in view of Matsumoto et al., Miyata et al. (EP 1 475 988), and Lee et al. (U.S. 5,917,477). Claims 24-26 and 31-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nir et al.

and Harwood et al., and further view of Matsumoto et al., Miyata et al., Lee et al., and Miyake et al. (U.S. 2001/0019877).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 15-35.

Claim 20 recites:

A mobile display apparatus serving as a client device of an external host apparatus, the mobile display apparatus comprising:  
a display section;  
a voice output section;  
**a video signal input section arranged to receive an input video signal from the external host apparatus;**  
a display control section arranged to display in the display section an image based on the input video signal;  
a text recognizing section arranged to extract a text portion from the input video signal and convert the text portion into a text code; and  
a voice output control section arranged to output voice sounds corresponding to the text code through the voice output section; wherein  
the video signal input section outputs the input video signal supplied from the external host apparatus to the display control section and the text recognizing section; and  
the text recognizing section converts a text portion of the input video signal supplied from the video signal input section into a text code and outputs the text code to the voice output control section so that an image corresponding to the input video signal is displayed in the display section, and the voice sounds corresponding to the text code are outputted from the voice output section. (emphasis added)

With the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicant's claim 20, Applicant has been able to provide a study aid that allows a user to aurally confirm text messages (see, for example, paragraph [0009] of the originally filed specification).

The Examiner alleged that Nir et al. teaches "a display section (**see col. 14, lines 50-53**); a voice output section (**see col. 15, lines 61-63**); [and] a video signal input section for receiving an input video signal from the external host apparatus (**see fig. 3, element 110**).” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner alleged that element 110 shown in Fig. 3 of Nir corresponds to the claimed feature of "a video signal input section arranged to receive an input video signal from

the external host apparatus.” This is not correct. As is clearly seen in Fig. 3 of Nir and described in Column 9, lines 52-54, element 110 is merely a box of a flowchart that shows a step of “scanning a portion of text.” This text box of a flowchart clearly cannot constitute a video signal input section and cannot receive input video signals from an external host apparatus. At best, this flowchart text box 110 merely shows that text, NOT video signals, can be input by a user to the device of Nir et al.

Further, Nir et al. discloses a technique for a stand-alone hand held apparatus 12 which includes a scanner that scans a portion of a text 14 in a first language, shown in Fig. 1 of Nir et al., and a computerized system that performs an OCR of the scanned text 112, translates the scanned text to another language 118, and then outputs the translation of the scanned text 120, shown in Fig. 3 of Nir et al. Nir et al. makes no mention of an external host apparatus for supplying an input video signal to the hand-held device or a video signal input section that is arranged to receive an input video signal from such an external host apparatus.

Thus, contrary to the Examiner’s allegations, Nir et al. clearly fails to teach or suggest an external host apparatus arranged to supply an input for the stand-alone apparatus 12, and Nir et al. certainly fails to teach or suggest the feature of “a video signal input section arranged to receive an input video signal from such the external host apparatus” as recited in Applicant’s claim 20.

Furthermore, Nir et al. clearly teaches away from including any other external devices. The hand-held device 12 is operable in an entirely stand-alone manner, as is described by column 5, line 24-55 of Nir et al. Accordingly, it would not have even been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to include an external host device or a video signal input section arranged to receive an input video signal from such the external host apparatus with the hand-held device 12 of Nir et al. because doing so would be in direct opposition to the stand-alone functionality required by Nir et al.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nir et al.

Claim 15 recites:

A mobile display apparatus serving as a client device of an external host apparatus, the mobile display apparatus comprising:  
a display section;  
a voice output section;  
**a text code input section arranged to receive an input text code from the external host apparatus;**  
a display control section arranged to display in the display section text corresponding to the input text code; and  
a voice output control section arranged to output voice sounds corresponding to the input text code through the voice output section; wherein  
the text code input section outputs the input text code to the display control section and the voice output control section to display in the display section the text corresponding to the input text code, and output the voice sounds corresponding to the input text code through the voice output section. (emphasis added)

The Examiner alleged that Nir et al. teaches “a display section (see col. 14, lines 50-53); a voice output section (see col. 15, lines 61-63);” “a text code input section arranged to receive an input text code from the external host apparatus (see fig. 3, element 114)” and that Harwood et al. teaches “receiving an input text code from an external host apparatus (see col. 9, lines 42-49),” and that “[i]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Nir [et al.], and have receiving an input code from an external host apparatus, as taught by Harwood, thus enhancing safety and convenience, as discussed by Harwood (see col. 1, lines 21-23).” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As similarly discussed above, Nir et al. teaches a stand-alone hand-held device 12 for scanning text 14, as described in column 6, lines 30-44 and column 9, lines 25-30 of Nir et al. This hand-held device 12 is used to provide a user with an exposure to both a spoken form, and an interpretation of the scanned text, as is described by Nir et al. in column 5, lines 24-40. The Examiner admits that Nir et al. fails to teach receiving an input text code from an external host such as is recited in claim 15.

Harwood et al. teaches the transmission of SMS text messages between hands-free cell phones, as described in column 9, lines 42-63. Harwood et al. shows that when the hands-free telephone system receives an SMS text message from a cell phone, the user decides whether or not to convert the SMS messages into audio messages, indicated by element 106 in Fig. 4 of Harwood et al.

The Examiner alleged that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the SMS text messages of Harwood et al. in the hand-held device 12 of Nir et al. because, as is stated in the third paragraph of page 4 of the outstanding Office Action, such a proposed combination would allegedly enhance "safety and convenience." However, the hand-held device 12 of Nir et al. is not a cell phone, and it has no capacity to receive SMS text messages. Furthermore the Examiner has not provided any explanation or suggestion as to how SMS messages would make the hand-held device of Nir et al. either safer or more convenient.

Furthermore, column 1, lines 21-23 of Harwood et al., upon which the Examiner relies for the alleged motivation for combining Harwood et al. with Nir et al., merely refers to the general benefits of providing hands-free telephone systems including, for example, wireless Bluetooth modules.

The hand-held apparatus of Nir et al. already includes a wireless headset, as described in column 6, lines 41-44 of Nir et al., and thus already provides the benefits that the Examiner has alleged would be provided by Harwood et al. Since Nir et al. already has wireless capabilities and therefore clearly provides the advantages of hands-free communication, there would be no reason to combine the wireless features of Harwood with Nir et al. as proposed by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Nir et al. and Harwood et al., applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in claim 15 of the present application.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim

15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nir et al. and Harwood et al.

The Examiner relied upon Matsumoto et al., Miyata et al., Lee et al., and Miyake et al. to allegedly cure the deficiencies of Nir et al. and Harwood et al. However, Matsumoto et al., Miyata et al., Lee et al., and Miyake et al. also clearly fail to teach or suggest the feature of “a text code input section arranged to receive an input text code from the external host apparatus” as recited in Applicant’s claim 15. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Matsumoto et al., Miyata et al., Lee et al., and Miyake et al. fail to cure the deficiencies of Nir et al. and Harwood et al. described above.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15 and 20 are allowable. Claims 16-19 and 21-35 depend upon claims 15 and 20, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claims 15 and 20 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 25, 2008

/Peter Medley #56,125/  
Attorneys for Applicant

**KEATING & BENNETT, LLP**  
1800 Alexander Bell Drive, Suite 200  
Reston, VA 20191  
Telephone: (571) 313-7440  
Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368  
  
Peter Medley  
Registration No. 56,125